

m.f



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,966	11/29/2000	Sangeetha Narasimhan	10003088-1	1711

7590 08/18/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PARK, CHAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/726,966	Applicant(s) NARASIMHAN, SANGEETHA	
	Examiner CHAN S. PARK	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**DOUGLAS Q. TRAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p> |
|--|--|

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 6/5/06, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-5 and 7-11** are pending.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 5, filed 6/5/06, with respect to claim objection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The Objection of claims 2, 3 and 5 has been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 6/5/06, with respect to claim rejection have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant states that Mantell (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,993) fails to teach a printer controller automatically selecting a print media based on the selection of a print quality mode. Particularly, the applicant states that Mantell teaches away from the printer controller automatically selecting the print media since the user is free to disregard the highlighted recommendation made by the printer controller. The examiner disagrees. Mantell explicitly teaches that the print driver makes a print media choice/selection, by highlighting one of the print media type, for the recommendation. "It is also possible, that upon selection of one of the print quality modes 92, ***the print driver 84 might automatically highlight one of the media type*** 102 as a recommendation to the user to use that type of media when printing in the selected print

Art Unit: 2625

quality mode" (col. 7, lines 56-60). Further, the applicant's cited portion of Mantell describes that the user simply confirms the selections made to begin the printing. The selection made by user here is only "the OK selector 112", not the selection of the media type. Even if, without conceding, the user makes the final selection of the media type, it is based on the selection made by the print driver. It is noted that disregarding the print media type highlighted by the print driver is irrelevant to the current claims because, in either case, the print driver makes the selection for the recommendation. The process performed by the current invention might be different than what Mantell teaches. However, this difference is not apparent in the current claim wording.

Therefore, the rejections of **claims 1-5 and 7-11**, as cited in the Office Action dated 6/5/06, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), are maintained and repeated in this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mantell U.S. Patent No. 6,189,993.

4. With respect to claim 1, Mantell teaches a method for selecting a print job parameter (fig. 5) including the steps of:

a printer controller ascertaining an operator-selected toner density setting; and  
the printer controller automatically selecting a print media source based upon the operator-selected toner density setting (col. 7, lines 54-60).

Note that the printer controller automatically selects/highlights one of the media type as a recommendation to the user upon the selection of one of the print quality mode.

5. With respect to claim 2, Mantell teaches the method of claim 1 wherein,  
the step of printer controller ascertaining an operator-selected toner density setting comprises the printer controller ascertaining an operator-selected draft toner density setting; and

the step of the printer controller automatically selecting the print media source based upon the operator-selected toner density setting comprises the printer controller automatically selecting a draft media source based upon the operator-selected draft toner density setting (col. 7, lines 54-60).

According to the teachings of Mantell, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in that art that an appropriate media type for the draft quality mode is selected/highlighted when the user selects the draft mode.

6. With respect to claim 3, Mantell teaches the method of claim 1 wherein, the step of printer controller ascertaining an operator-selected toner density setting comprises the printer controller ascertaining an operator-selected standard toner density setting; and

the step of the printer controller automatically selecting the print media source based upon the operator-selected toner density setting comprises the printer controller automatically selecting a standard media source based upon the operator-selected standard toner density setting (col. 7, lines 54-60).

According to the teachings of Mantell, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in that art that an appropriate media type for the standard quality mode is selected/highlighted when the user selects the standard mode.

7. With respect to claim 7, Mantell discloses a printer controller configured to: automatically recognize a selection of one of a plurality settings for a first print job parameter (print quality in fig. 5); and

in response to recognizing the selection of the first print job parameter setting, automatically select one of a plurality settings for a second print job parameter (media type in col. 7, lines 54-60).

8. With respect to claim 8, Mantell discloses the printer controller of claim 7, wherein the first print job parameter comprises toner density and the second print job parameter comprises a source of print media (col. 7, lines 54-60).

9. With respect to claim 10, Mantell discloses the printer controller of claim 8, wherein the printer controller is configured to:

automatically recognize a selection of a draft toner density setting; and  
in response to recognizing the selection of a draft toner density setting, automatically select a source of draft print media col. 7, lines 54-60).

According to the teachings of Mantell, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in that art that an appropriate media type for the draft quality mode is selected/highlighted when the user selects the draft mode.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 5, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantell.

10. With respect to claim 4, Mantell teaches a method for selecting a print job parameter including the steps of:

a printer controller ascertaining an operator-selected print media source setting;  
and

selecting a toner density setting to provide an appropriate print quality mode which matches with the media type (col. 7, lines 54-60).

As noted above in claim 1, upon selection of one of the print quality mode, the printer controller automatically selects/highlights one of the media type that is appropriate for the selected print quality mode. However, Mantell does not teach whether it can be done the other way.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to automatically select/highlight one of the print quality mode as a recommendation for the selected print media type.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to inform the user of the best match print quality mode for the selected media type.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

11. With respect to claim 5, as noted above in claim 4 and 2, it is apparent to one of ordinary skill in that art that an appropriate print quality mode (draft mode) for the draft media type is selected/highlighted when the user selects the draft media type.

12. With respect to claim 9, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4, are applicable.



13. With respect to claim 11, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5, are applicable.

***Conclusion***

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S. PARK whose telephone number is (571) 272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

csp  
August 10, 2006

Chan S. Park  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2625

*Chan S. Park*

**DOUGLAS Q. TRAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*Douglas Q. Tran*